

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1-10 stand rejected. In light of the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Claims 1-2 and 5-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,819,178 ("Cropper"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must disclose every element of the claim, as arranged in the claim, and in sufficient detail to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the anticipated subject matter. See, PPG Industries, Inc. v. Guardian Industries Corp., 75 F.3d 1558, 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1996); C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Sys., Inc., 157 F.3d 1340, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1998). A reference that does not expressly disclose all of the elements of a claimed invention cannot anticipate unless all of the undisclosed elements are inherently present in the reference. See, Continental Can Co. USA v. Monsanto Co., 942 F.2d 1264, 1268 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The Office Action asserts that all of the limitations of claims 1 and 5 are present in Cropper. In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that

"Cropper receives a packet from a mobile station at an HLR of a home network and searches for subscriber data (col. 5, Ins. 1-11). If not found, a VLR of the home network is searched (col. 5, Ins. 12-18). (The request is transmitted to the VLR). If the HLR or the VLR of the home network contains the subscriber data and the data is authenticated, then the MS will communicate with the home network. Therefore, the packet is transmitted to a predetermined server or a network connected device (VLR) if it is not authenticated." See Office Action at 2.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that this portion of Cropper discloses Applicant's explicitly recited limitation that when the terminal station has not been authenticated, that the pack is transmitted to a predetermined server or a network connected device.

According to Cropper, if the subscriber data is not found in the HLR database of HLR/VLR/ISR 130 in the visiting wireless home network, the subscriber data request is broadcast to the HLRs of other wireless networks. The only the HLR of the home wireless network replies the subscriber data request accompanying the subscriber data corresponding to the mobile identification data in the subscriber data request.

In Cropper, the HLR/VLR/ISR searches the ISR database for an address corresponding to the MIN in the registration request. If the second wireless network is not the home network of the mobile station, its HLR will not find subscriber data and consequently the HLR will not respond to the subscriber data request. However, the HLR of the home network of the mobile terminal locates the subscriber data corresponding to the MIN specified and responds to the subscriber data request by copying the subscriber data to the HLR/VLR/ISR of the serving wireless network. If the subscriber data is not found, the system initiates a refusal of registration request. The subscriber's data is not forwarded to a specific server or network drive.

In Applicant's system when a non-authenticated terminal has its transmission packet forwarded to a specific server or network connected device. The contents of the first packet distributing table represent that the terminal station has not been authenticated for the LAN (which corresponds to " if the subscriber data is not found in the HLR database of HLR/VLR/ISR 130 in the visiting wireless home network"), then the packet is transmitted to the predetermined server or network-connected device.

Applicant's claim 1 is different from Cropper because Cropper necessitates the broadcast of the subscriber data request, while claims 1 and 5 do not necessitate such broadcast because destination of the packet is predetermined. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Cropper fails to disclose the explicitly recited limitations in claims 1-2 and 5-6. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,873,609 ("Jones") in view of Router Plugins: A Software Architecture for Next Generation Routers" ("Decasper"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. The prior art references must also teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim in question. See, M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). A reference can only be used for what it clearly discloses or suggests. See, In re Hummer, 113 U.S.P.Q. 66 (C.C.P.A. 1957); In re Stencel, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Here, the references, whether taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention claimed by the Applicant.

Jones fails to disclose transmitting the packet received from said introduced portion to said predetermined server network connecting device when said contents of said first package distribution table represented the terminal station has not been authenticated for said LAN.

The Office Action asserts that this claimed limitation is disclosed at column 3, lines 20-37 in Jones. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees. In the cited portion of

Jones, a new user ID, a temporary password are preprogrammed in CD software that is signaled to an authentication server. The authentication server recognizes the user as a new user and communicates a set of filters so that a point-to-point protocol session is set up between the user's PC and the access operator's registration server. The user is barred from accessing any other services. Additionally, there are no unregistered packets to be transmitted. This is merely a login technique. The addition of Decasper fails to cure the deficiency in Jones discussed above. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Further, the authentication request information of claim 1 does not correspond to the new user of Jones, nor does the reception packet correspond to the new user of Jones. In addition, RADIUS which is regarded as allegedly corresponding to the authentication managing portion of claim 1 performs authentication for accessing the access Network operator registration Server 36, and does not perform authentication for using the managed IP network.

Further, the Examiner asserts that "transferring the packet received from the interface portion to the LAN" of claim 1 corresponds to "transferring the packet to the managed IP network" reside in somewhere. However, this assertion is incorrect because the access operator RADIUS authentication server 34 does not transfer the packet anywhere. Still further, the Examiner asserts that "transmitting to the packet received from the interface portion to the predetermined Server or network-connected device" of claim 1 corresponds to "transmitting the packet to the Access Operators registration server 36. However, this assertion is wrong, because the packet is transferred between the server 36 and the PC 22 not via the Server 34. Jones is silent as to the two destinations of the packet which once was received by the Server (server 34) of claim 1.

Therefore, the rejection reason to claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 under Section 102(b) over Cropper is apparently wrong. The rejection reason to claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 under Section 103(a) over Jones and Decasper is apparently wrong. The rejection reason to claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 under Section 103(a) over Cropper and Bugnon is apparently wrong. The rejection reason to claims 9 and 10 under Section 103(a) over Cropper and Peck is apparently wrong.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: February 17, 2006

Respectfully Submitted,

By

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY
LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorneys for Applicant

IRB/mgs